

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/055,366	MALLE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Susan T. Tran	1615	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Susan T. Tran.

 (2) B. J. Sadoff.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 January 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:


Claims discussed:

 Prior art documents discussed:  
*of record*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: to place the application in condition for allowance, it was suggested to 1) correct typographical error in claim 77; 2) add step (ii) in claim 93; and 3) delete the limitation "or hydrophobic compound" in claim 93. Applicant proposed further define the "hydrophobic compound" in the use of the Markush language. Applicant's attorney authorized the Examiner's Amendment. .